



THE UNIVERSITY *of* EDINBURGH

## Edinburgh Research Explorer

### From the ashes of the Great Kant earthquake

**Citation for published version:**

Perkins, C 2019, 'From the ashes of the Great Kant earthquake: The Tokyo imperial university settlement', *Japan Forum*, vol. 31, no. 3, pp. 408-433. <https://doi.org/10.1080/09555803.2018.1544585>

**Digital Object Identifier (DOI):**

[10.1080/09555803.2018.1544585](https://doi.org/10.1080/09555803.2018.1544585)

**Link:**

[Link to publication record in Edinburgh Research Explorer](#)

**Document Version:**

Peer reviewed version

**Published In:**

Japan Forum

**Publisher Rights Statement:**

This is an Accepted Manuscript of an article published by Taylor & Francis in Japan Forum on 11/12/2018, available online: <https://www.tandfonline.com/doi/full/10.1080/09555803.2018.1544585>.

**General rights**

Copyright for the publications made accessible via the Edinburgh Research Explorer is retained by the author(s) and / or other copyright owners and it is a condition of accessing these publications that users recognise and abide by the legal requirements associated with these rights.

**Take down policy**

The University of Edinburgh has made every reasonable effort to ensure that Edinburgh Research Explorer content complies with UK legislation. If you believe that the public display of this file breaches copyright please contact [openaccess@ed.ac.uk](mailto:openaccess@ed.ac.uk) providing details, and we will remove access to the work immediately and investigate your claim.





**From the Ashes of the Great Kantō Earthquake: The Tokyo Imperial University Settlement**

Journal:	<i>Japan Forum</i>
Manuscript ID	RJFO-2018-0006.R1
Manuscript Type:	Original Article
Keywords:	Settlement Movement, Taisho Japan, Social Work, Student Movement, Law, Shinjinkai

SCHOLARONE™  
Manuscripts

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

From the Ashes of the Great Kantō Earthquake: The Tokyo Imperial University Settlement

For Peer Review Only

## Introduction

In 1884, an Anglican clergyman and staff and students from Oxford University set up a 'settlement house' in the East End of London. Conceiving poverty as a moral problem, their goal was to live with the poor to raise their cultural standards, and by giving them something to strive for pull them out of the cycle of destitution. The idea soon spread to the United States, where settlement houses sprang up across the country. That the Settlement movement would travel across the Atlantic is no surprise: there was rich exchange of ideas between the UK and US in the late 19<sup>th</sup> century, and the values underpinning the movement – namely a particular protestant understanding of the relationship between morality and work – were shared. But what is perhaps less expected is that the Settlement movement also travelled to Japan, where it was put into practice by a range of governmental and non-government actors. How was Settlement thought adapted to the Japanese context? What were its goals, methods, and outcomes? And what can this example tell us about the global circulation of ideas regarding social responsibility, the state, and welfare in the inter-war period? To start answering these questions, this article charts the establishment by students from Tokyo Imperial University of the best-known pre-war settlement house, hereafter referred to as the Teidai Settlement.

Although it was not the first settlement house, and would certainly not be the last, the Teidai Settlement is often described as representative of the student driven Settlement movement in prewar Japan.<sup>1</sup> To date, however, discussion of the Teidai Settlement has been mostly restricted to the Japanese language literature. This literature contains general overviews of the early years of the Teidai house (Miyada 1995; Tsuruda 2015; Uemura 1995), as well as discussions of the Teidai Settlement in the context of a crisis in welfare provision in the interwar period in Japan (Gotō 2014; Masaharu 1993), the impact of settlement

---

<sup>1</sup> The first private settlement house, Kingsley Hall (*Kingusurē-kan*) was set up by Katayama Sen in 1897. Other notable settlements include the Kōbō-kan Community Centre, which was established in 1919 by North American missionaries and members of the Japan Women's Christian Temperance Union, and which is still active today ([http://www.kobokan.jp/e\\_index.htm](http://www.kobokan.jp/e_index.htm)); the Buddhist Mahayana Gakuen, also established in 1919 (<http://www.mahayana.or.jp/nadeshiko/>); and public institutions such as the Ōsaka North Citizens Hall (*Ōsaka kita shimin-kan*) which was established by Shiga Shinato in 1921 (see Hensō iin kai 2014, p. 28; Masaharu, 312). Postwar settlements include Tokyo's Hikawaka Settlement. The first book length treatment of the Great British and North American Settlement movement to be published in Japan, *Settlement Research (Settsurumento [sic] no kenkyū)*, was written by Ōbayashi Munetsugu in 1922 (Ōbayashi 2008 [1922]).

practice on theories of social welfare in Japan (Nakasuji 1998), and outcomes of work conducted by the various units within the house (Asano 1995; Fukumoto 2001). Morgan (2016 chap 3) contains a discussion of the Teidai Settlement but does so mainly from the perspective of the two legal scholars involved in the project: Suehiro Izutarō and Hozumi Shigetō.

This paper adds to the literature by investigating the Teidai Settlement as a ‘proto-professional’ approach to Japan’s early 20<sup>th</sup> century social problem at a time when extant systems of social care had reached the limits of what could be achieved (Masaharu 1993).<sup>2</sup> In telling this story I take methodological cues from the work of Andrew Abbott (1988) on the professions. In his historical sociology of the rise of the professions in the 19<sup>th</sup> and 20<sup>th</sup> century, Abbott showed how groups of individuals with discrete bodies of knowledge competed within a system of professions for jurisdiction over definition and treatment of social issues. The competition tended to move through a process by which external disturbances in the social order – be they technological, social or natural – brought about jurisdictional competition between organised bodies (the professions) over who had jurisdiction over the disturbance, after which a new social equilibrium was achieved. Although there are clear differences between the Teidai Settlement case and the fully formed professional bodies Abbott studied, his system approach grants a useful point of departure and narrative backbone for the discussion that follows.

In brief my argument runs as follows. Although basic municipal and private provision for the poor had existed in Japan from the Meiji period (1868-1912), accelerated economic and social disturbances in the Taishō period (1912-1926) rendered those approaches untenable. By the turn of the 20<sup>th</sup> century, poverty in the countryside was endemic and in city slums across the nation an expanding class of labouring poor were carrying out their lives in increasingly agitated squalor. In response intellectuals, bureaucrats and reformers looked abroad for new theories to help them address these social problems, and by doing so ward

<sup>2</sup> Abbott’s definition of ‘profession’ is loose enough to encapsulate the Teidai settlement: ‘exclusive groups of individuals applying somewhat abstract knowledge to particular cases’ (1985, p. 318).

off the social unrest and revolutionary ferment they observed plaguing the west.<sup>3</sup> However, progressives did not simply cherry-pick from available options from the west and implement them wholesale (Hanes 2008, p.61). Instead, they 'proposed a complex process of adoption and adaptation that acknowledged the subtle differences between nations and societies' (ibid.). These technological disturbances then led conceptualisations of the social problem that privileged a new breed of educated elite armed with social scientific knowledge and techniques. Just as this elite was getting to work, however, the Taishō crisis was exacerbated by a further environmental disturbance, the Great Kantō Earthquake of 1923, which decimated existing social institutions, including nascent welfare institutions, and opened space for further experimentation with methods of governance of the poor. The Teidai Settlement was borne in the context of this succession of disturbances.

To show how the Teidai Settlement carved out its jurisdiction, I focus on events leading up to the decision to establish the Teidai Settlement house and some of the house's early activities. Here I show how the crisis of the earthquake enabled students from Tokyo Imperial to put into practice their social scientific training, how the jurisdiction of the settlement was justified in terms of its utility to the nation and the development of Japanese social sciences, and how that justification placed the settlement within the mesh of government and non-governmental institutions of the time. I also show how the ideological orientation of a large contingent of students at Teidai were conducive to Settlement activities, but how infighting precipitated further disturbances that led to the Settlement moving into new jurisdictions. The details of the third phase, equilibrium, indicate why I have opted for the term 'proto-professional' to describe the work of the settlement. As will be shown, the Teidai Settlement was only stable for a short time, and another exogenous disturbance – the onset of the second Sino-Japanese War in 1937 – led to its closure as jurisdiction over the social issues the Settlement laid claim to was reclaimed by the state.

---

<sup>3</sup> Key texts on governing the Taishō crisis are Duus (1982), Hanes (2008, 2012), Hastings (1995), Garon (1987), Gordon (1991) and Pyle (1973, 1974).

Before addressing the Teidai Settlement directly, however, I will first provide a brief sketch of the origins of settlement thought in Great Britain and the United States.

**The Emergence of Settlement Thought**

Settlement thought emerged in the 19<sup>th</sup> century within the context of wide-ranging debates in Great Britain about how best to address the ‘social problem’. Rapid industrialisation over the preceding century had produced slums in which exploited labourers lived in a cycle of destitution and disease far removed from the lives of the British middle and upper-classes. The existence of these slums, as well as worries over the fragmentation of British society, tugged at the consciences of the middle and upper-classes, both because of the inequity of the class divide, and because of the radicalism that divide was likely to cause. Thus, by the late Victorian period, according to prominent Liberal statesman Sir William Harcourt (1827-1904), British politicians were ‘all socialists now’ (Freeden 1986, p.25) although the nature of that socialism, how it squared with the individualist Liberalism of the day, and what sort of action it proposed, was debated extensively. One point on which a wide variety of progressives agreed, however, was that British socialism should not be a revolutionary or utopian credo. For the New Liberals, British socialism was simply the humanist recognition that people were social creatures; as such in opposition to *laissez-faire*, securing the best outcomes for the greatest number required just access to the social goods that enable fair competition in the market. Progress towards this goal should be based on empirical knowledge of the social sphere, seen as distinct from the economic and the political, and be a gradual process of adjustment of social intuitions in light of that knowledge (Freeden 1986, pp. 39-43). This programme was also key to warding off calls for a revolutionary socialism that would fundamentally alter the social order.

The rationale and goals of the settlement founders fit within this gradualist framework of British socialism in that it built its platform of engagement with the social problem upon the individualistic humanist traditions of 19<sup>th</sup> century liberalism. However, settlers also rejected legislation as a solution, instead emphasising the positive outcomes that would arise from suturing the division between the classes through community building (Evans 2006, p. 144). This emphasis on community also formed the basis of their critique of existing approaches

1  
2  
3 to bridging the gap between the classes, such as Charity organisations, workingman's  
4 colleges, and university extension courses. In their view, it was not enough for the privileged  
5 few to sally forth into the slums of London, dispense knowledge or alms, then retreat back  
6 to the safe embrace of their warm fires and pleasant conversation. To do so would not only  
7 highlight and exacerbate the divide between the classes; it would also make it impossible to  
8 impart to the poor that all-important Victorian key to success: good character. For while  
9 educating the poor was important, education alone would not break the cycle of poverty. In  
10 the words of leading progressive liberal Samuel Barnett (1844-1913), one of the founders of  
11 the most well-known settlement house Toynbee Hall, the people:

12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20 Must be made capable of enjoying the highest things. They need, therefore,  
21 something more than technical teaching; it is not enough for England to be the  
22 workshop of the world; it must export thoughts and hopes as well as machines  
23  
24  
25 (Evans 2006)  
26

27  
28  
29 Thus, the settlement founders argued, the educated elite had a moral duty to live with the  
30 poor on a daily basis so as to develop in the working-classes the 'thoughts and hopes' –  
31 the striving, aspirational character – that would lead them out of the slums. Funds and  
32 volunteers quickly flowed in, and in 1884 the first Settlement Houses, Toynbee Hall in  
33 Whitechapel and The Oxford House in Bethnal Green, were established. By 1911 there were  
34 14 settlements in East London and 45 in Britain (Evans 2006, p.114). The idea soon travelled  
35 across the Atlantic to the US, where the first settlement houses were established in Boston,  
36 New York and Chicago in 1890 (Carson 1990, p. 27). Once established in the US, settlement  
37 workers set about grappling with the vast challenges in city slums produced by waves of  
38 mass immigration. By 1920 there were 440 settlements across the United States (Reinders  
39 1982, p.49).  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47

48  
49 But how did this movement translate to Japan? The history of thought on and policy  
50 towards Japan's poor labouring classes in the prewar period demonstrates that rather than  
51 out of the blue, settlement thought was just one aspect of a broader trend of importing,  
52 modifying and applying new technologies of interacting with, understanding, and ultimately  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60



governing the poor in the context of mass politics and increasing social unrest at the turn of the 20<sup>th</sup> century.

**The Social Problem in inter-war Japan**

Much like the assumptions underpinning early settlement theory in Great Britain, state approaches to the problem of poverty in the early Meiji Japan assumed poverty was a consequence of individual failings rather than a condition with social causes. Furthermore, Meiji elites held a deep suspicion of state-led social welfare, which in their view had the potential to breed into the working classes a sense of entitlement antithetical to the hard work required of a modernising state playing catch-up with the west. This attitude manifested in the 1874 Poor Law (*Jukkyū kisoku*), which made local governments responsible for poverty relief and placed emphasis on the extended family as primary provider. In the cities, where it was difficult to identify and put pressure upon families to provide welfare for their poverty-stricken relatives, however, some attempt at poverty-relief existed. Starting with the Tokyo Poorhouse (*Yōikuin*) in 1872, authorities built a number of small-scale facilities in the capital. These facilities, however, were woefully inadequate for scale of the issue and appeared more of a performance for external visitors than a concerted attempt at addressing the emergent social problem (Hastings 1995, pp.18-19).

By the turn of the century such attitudes towards the poor were increasingly challenged. This was partly due to a re-evaluation in Japan of the nation’s place in the development of world history. Rather than a world-historical outlier, by the 1880s Japanese intellectuals and bureaucrats began to view Japan as on a universal path of national development, one already trodden by the advanced western nations. On this view, the experiences of the west loomed in Japan’s future. Observers in Japan noted the march of industrialisation in the west had produced a range of social problems: friction between the classes, conflict between workers and the owners of capital, alienation of labourers from their traditional communities, and concomitant social unrest (Pyle 1973, p.53; 1974, p. 130). The omens were not good.

Events on the run up to and during the Taishō period (1912-1926) then indicated to elites that it was now Japan's turn to confront the social problems borne of advanced industrialisation. Public anger, which spilled over into riots, at the seemingly unfavourable 1905 Portsmouth Treaty after cessation of hostilities in the Russo-Japanese war, spoke to Japanese elites of the potential danger of the growing political consciousness of the masses. The 1910 High Treason Incident, in which socialist-anarchist revolutionaries attempted to assassinate the Meiji Emperor, become an example of the risk posed by unchecked poverty and social unrest. Furthermore, the 1917 Bolshevik revolution provided a clear warning of the existential danger to the state of dismissing the needs of the labouring classes.

But it was in the years following the end of World War One that events demonstrated for the governing classes the pressing need in Japan for new approaches to the social problem. Although Japan's economy had benefited greatly from the destruction wreaked by the conflict in Europe on the industries of competitor nations, inflation and social dislocation as workers moved into the industrial cities were more than ever eating away at the national ideal of harmony between workers, industrialists and the political classes. The Rice Riots of 1918, which spread across the nation and took more than a month to put down, were for anxious observers further evidence of the need to take welfare provision for the labouring classes seriously, as was the ramping of up of labour activism and student radicalism. As Duus (1982, p.425) characterises the climate of the time:

The explosion of labour disputes in 1919-20, the radicalisation of students at imperial universities and other middle-class recruiting grounds, the return of old socialists to public prominence, the stirrings of discontent in rural areas – all suggested that the problem of social conflict was more profound than it had been at the beginning of the Taishō period...

In dealing with the social problem, however, Japan's late development now came as an advantage. Japanese officials and intellectuals quickly realised they need not reinvent the wheel when approaching social issues and could instead look to new theories of governance arising in the west (see for example Pyle 1974). Thus, as newspapers articles and book length publications documented the blight of poverty in Japan's lower classes, progressives

brought back from sabbaticals in Great Britain, Germany and to a lesser extent the United States, theories of social organicism which reconceptualised poverty as a disease of the social body and practical social scientific tools for stopping those diseases from spreading. Attitudes regarding the state's role in welfare provision were also changing within the bureaucracy, and in particular the powerful Home Ministry. From its inception in 1873, the Home Ministry had been staffed by well-connected generalists suspicious of technical training. But by the turn of the century, and specifically from the end of the 1904-5 Russo-Japanese War, the Home Ministry increasingly admitted to its ranks graduates from Tokyo Imperial University. These new bureaucrats, dubbed the *Shinjin* (New Men), educated within a milieu of exciting new ideas brought back from the west and wedded to grand narratives of themselves as visionary men charged with the reformation of society, brought with them new social science knowledge and techniques to apply to the ever-growing issue of poverty and labour unrest (Garon 1987, p. 76-78).

In 1919, this new mode of thinking manifested in the Social Bureau of the City of Tokyo. In justifying the expense of the undertaking, which necessitated funds from taxation and as such met fierce resistance, Tokyo bureaucrats made a new jurisdictional distinction between charity (*jizen*) and social work (*shakai jigyo*). They argued that in simple economies, discrete acts of philanthropy were enough to deal with the problem of poverty. Thus, in the past, when the Tokyo Poor House and its meagre offshoots were the only institutions dealing with poverty-relief, direct donations from the wealthy were enough. But in complex economies where individuals were pitted against each other in a labyrinthine and uncaring marketplace, it was up to the authorities to intervene both to head off social unrest, and because it was the moral thing to do. As Hastings (1995, p. 43) puts it, the new breed of Tokyo bureaucrats believed adamantly that the state 'must not delegate responsibility for the victims of society to philanthropists alone but must act itself to provide aid'. And act it did. By September of 1923 the Social Bureau had established labour exchanges, nurseries, health consultation facilities, rooming houses and apartments, public dining halls, and were just about to complete a maternity hospital (ibid., p. 46).

Then disaster struck. The last and furthest reaching event to impact thinking in Japan on engagement with the poor in the Taishō period was the 1923 Great Kantō Earthquake. This

1  
2  
3 earthquake and the fires that followed destroyed most of Tokyo, including the Social Bureau  
4 and the vast majority of its newly established facilities, and killed over 140,000 people  
5 (Clancey 2006, p.220). In doing so, the quake produced a material and ideological breach in  
6 the fabric of Tokyo, and Japan more generally, which provided space for further  
7 experimentation with newer and more radical approaches to engaging with the social  
8 problem. The breakdown in public order subsequent to the earthquake also exacerbated  
9 fears amongst the elite that their customary top-down approach to governance was under  
10 threat (Borland 2006, p.884). It is in this context that the Teidai Settlement was established,  
11 to which we now turn.  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19

### 20 **The Great Kantō Earthquake and jurisdictional conflicts**

21  
22  
23 The official history of the Teidai Settlement (Ōmori et al. 1937) starts with a voyage abroad.<sup>4</sup>  
24 On 1<sup>st</sup> July 1923, thirty-eight Teidai students boarded a military ship to take a tour of the  
25 previously German-owned South Sea Islands, which had been granted to Japan under the  
26 1919 Treaty of Versailles. The expedition was arranged by the Naval authorities and was to  
27 last two months; it was most likely designed to socialise the Tokyo students into Japan's  
28 national military ideology, while also removing from Japan students involved in the  
29 expanding student movement, which in the eyes of the state was taking a worrying turn  
30 towards Marxism (Uemura 2001, p. 32). Whatever the reason, however, the trip took on a  
31 new inflection when on the very last leg of the return journey on 1<sup>st</sup> September, the  
32 students received a telegram informing them that a massive earthquake had hit Tokyo. On  
33 hearing the news, Uchimura Harushi,<sup>5</sup> a student radical who would later become heavily  
34 involved in the Teidai Settlement, recounted that 'the warm feelings of friendship and the  
35 images of the South Seas that made such a deep impression on me both disappeared; my  
36 thoughts simply raced to Tokyo' (Ōmori et al. 1937, p. 19).  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48

49 On 2<sup>nd</sup> September, the students returned to a scene of utter devastation. The city was in  
50 ruins: more than 140,000 people were dead, and hundreds of thousands of houses were  
51  
52

53 <sup>4</sup> This discussion draws heavily on the 12-year history of the Tokyo Imperial University Settlement (*Tōkyō*  
54 *teikoku daigaku setsurumento jūni-nen shi*) published in 1937 by the Teidai Settlement workers, and the  
55 recollections of settlers collected in Fukushima et. al. (1984).  
56

57 <sup>5</sup> Uchimura later changed his name to Ishijima Naoshi.  
58  
59  
60

1  
2  
3 either demolished by the quake or burnt down in the inferno that followed (Clancy 2006,  
4 p.220). The students rushed back to the Hongo campus of Tokyo Imperial to find it in tatters  
5 and occupied by over 2000 evacuees. Immediately, the students bedded down and began  
6 relief efforts (Ōmori et al. 1937, p. 20). A few days later, on 6<sup>th</sup> September, Teidai Law  
7 Professor Suehiro Izutarō (1888-1952) began shaping the students into a cohesive unit.  
8  
9

10  
11  
12  
13 Although a detailed examination of Suehiro’s academic and legal background is beyond the  
14 scope of this paper (for such a discussion see Morgan 2016), a brief discussion yields some  
15 explanations for his interest in the students’ activities and, as will be discussed later, his  
16 continued engagement with the Settlement. As an academic and a legal practitioner,  
17 Suerhiro was profoundly influenced by time spent in Germany studying the emerging “law –  
18 and society” movement. Core to this movement was German legal philosopher Eugen  
19 Ehrlich’s theory of the “living law”, which in opposition to the legal idealism dominant in  
20 Germany (and Japan) at the time, argued legal orders can and do develop in societies both  
21 organically and independently from the state. For thinkers like Ehrlich, the goal of the law –  
22 legal equity – was to be found not in state structures but was rather a ‘process of messy  
23 discovery taking place in the lower ranks of society’ (Morgan 2016, p. 89). Coupled with  
24 Suehiro’s previous exposure to legal pragmatism in the US, these experiences abroad led to  
25 him refashioning his own legal project into one in search of the “living law of Japan” so as to  
26 understand how the abstract law became reality in concrete local circumstances, and  
27 through this knowledge revise legal institutions to benefit the neglected Japanese labouring  
28 classes. This practical orientation to societal needs and drive to engage with the  
29 impoverished masses help explain why Suehiro was so impressed by the students’  
30 autonomous response to the needs of the evacuees, which he enthusiastically designated  
31 the ‘Student Relief Group’ (*Gakusei kyūgo dan*; Tsuruda 2015, p. 83). A few days later,  
32 Hozumi Shigetō (1883-1951), a Law professor of aristocratic decent who had also spent time  
33 abroad, including a visit to the first North American Settlement in Chicago (Miyada 1995,  
34 p88), and who shared Suehiro’s legal philosophy and sense of mission, also leant his hand to  
35 organising the students.  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52

53  
54 Without delay the newly constituted Relief Group applied its considerable energies to three  
55 main tasks:  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

1. Rationalising the distribution of food and securing standards of hygiene for evacuees;
2. Establishing a system for collecting and checking missing persons records;
3. Establishing an Earthquake Information Bureau.

The first task was to deliver provisions to the 2000 evacuees housed in the university campus, and here, even before the Teidai Settlement was established, we see that the students were suspicious of the effectiveness of standard practices of relief work. After seeking permission from the university authorities, the students drove a university truck to Akihabara, loaded it with supplies and returned to the campus. Rather than doling out the supplies on a first-come first-served basis, however, which would likely lead to uneven distribution, the students instituted a system whereby the evacuees were split into a number of self-governing units each tasked with managing a portion of the supplies (Ōmori et al. 1937, p. 20; Tsuruda 2011, p. 83; Uemura 2000, p. 33). According to Suehiro, this system resulted in efficient management of supplies, to the extent that even more refugees were attracted to the relative 'paradise' (*gokuraku*) of Hongo (Ōmori et al. 1937, p.20).

The second wave of refugees, however, brought with them rumours of appalling conditions faced by a far greater number of evacuees in Ueno Park (Fukushima et. al. 1984, p. 56). When the students arrived at Ueno to confirm the rumours with their own eyes, they were greeted by the following scene:

Food was distributed in Ueno Park by the local authorities on a first-come first-served basis. As a result, huge numbers of evacuees looking for food were forced to line up outside the distribution centre. Vegetables and other side dishes were not given out at all, and excrement was scattered about everywhere. The lack of hygiene was incredibly worrying (Ōmori et al. 1937, pp. 20-21).

Most of the supplies were brought to the site at random and were distributed haphazardly. The outcome was that the strong and the lucky were well looked after, while the weak and the unlucky were left hungry. Medical stations had been established, but their tents were

again located at random, and there seemed little concern for preventing the outbreak of infectious disease. On 10<sup>th</sup> September, after some wrangling with the local authorities, and following the intervention of Suehiro, 30 students equipped with shovels returned to Ueno, where they set up base. Drawing on the success of their organisational efforts at Hongo campus, the students directed evacuees to organise themselves into autonomous, self-governing units based on the wards of Tokyo, and set about constructing toilets and facilities for washing clothes.

To begin with the students' endeavours received a frosty reception from the suspicious local authorities, probably due to the aforementioned concerns over their potential Marxist leanings. There were also instances in which the pragmatism of the students came into conflict with values held by state officials and jurisdictional conflict ensued. For example, Uemura (1991, p. 35) tells us of the following exchange between a petty official and one student:

Official: It's fine to dig a toilet, but what are you going to do afterwards?  
Student: The only thing we can do is cover the area with disinfectant and leave it.  
Official: That's no good. Putting toilets elsewhere to one side, this is Imperial property, so you can't leave excrement here at random.  
Student: If that's the case, you're saying that it's fine to have urine and excrement flowing all over the area?  
Official: No, I'm not saying that. Of course, logically you have it right. But this is Imperial property, so we have a problem...

This somewhat comical conversation is at first glance about the sanctity of Imperial grounds. But when put into broader context discussed above of worries over governance of an increasingly politically aware labouring-class, the conversation takes on greater symbolic significance. In contrast to the highly visible Meiji Emperor, Emperor Taishō was a frail figure whose ill-health caused the Imperial Throne to withdraw its presence. In this sense, the conversation, which openly questioned the utility of maintaining the Imperial taboo, represents the broader issue of how the ailing Imperial institution, and the top-down social order it underpinned, would survive the onslaught of new ideas in the 1920s: an onslaught



made all the more dangerous by the turmoil brought about by the earthquake. Indeed, the state was well aware of this potential threat and responded by constructing a narrative that framed the earthquake as divine retribution for a society that had since the turn of the century descended into decadence (Borland 2006, p.890). This initiative included the publication by the Ministry of Education of stories of 'ideal subject-hood', in which acts of moral excellence during the catastrophe in the name of the Emperor were highlighted so as to realign subjects' values with those of the state (Borland 2011, p.29).

This being said, the efficacy of the students' approach in the chaos of the immediate aftermath of the earthquake won over the powers that be. The first-come first-served system used in the park was dropped, and students took over distribution of all supplies, including much needed vegetables collected by the students themselves. The hygiene problem proved more difficult to solve. The medical units were not interested in mundane practices like sanitation or cooperating with the students. It was only after the students appealed directly to the head of sanitation for Ueno that they were able to secure disinfectant and begin to address the hygiene issue (Ōmori et al. 1937, p. 22).

The second job concerned missing persons, and here again the students demonstrated their aptitude for rationalisation. The earthquake had caused death and displacement on a huge scale, and missing persons posters were appearing all over the city. However, there was as yet no way of collating information and creating a centralised register of missing persons. Again, the students were quick to act, conducting a survey of the 2000 people housed at Hongo, before striking out to survey evacuation centres across the city. Over the next 10 days, in concert with officials who were making their own lists, the students helped produce a comprehensive list of missing persons that was published in the Tokyo Nichinichi Shimbun (Ōmori et al. 1937, p. 22; Tsuruda 2011, p. 84). Information centres were then set up in schools and universities across the city, which coordinated and curated the lists and helped to reunite family members.

The third job was also related to the rationalisation and dissemination of information. Tokyo was then, as it is today, a city populated heavily by people from the prefectures. Suehiro, after a trip to Karuizawa, noted that on his return the trains were packed with people, who



he speculated were traveling to Tokyo to discover the fate of their loved ones. However understandable this urge might be, Suehiro felt that their presence would only put more strain on the city's already crippled infrastructure and cause more hurt for the evacuees. He thus urged the students to set up an information bureau with the purpose of sending updates to, and fielding questions from the prefectures. On 12 September, a notice was placed in the national and local papers calling for those seeking missing persons to contact the new information bureau. An article in the Yomiuri Shimbun from the same day notes that in the previous 10 days students had taken enquiries from 3500 people and were busy investigating the whereabouts of over 20,000 missing people (Yomiuri Shimbun 12/9/1923). By the 15<sup>th</sup> the bureau had received 15,000 enquiries (Tsuruda 2011, p. 84). Their work would largely fall into five categories: (1) Producing an accurate chart of the progress of fires after the quake; (2) Collecting the names of people convalescing in the many medical centres strewn across the city; (3) Producing an accurate list of the dead; (4) Searching for missing persons; and (5) Surveying structurally unsound buildings not destroyed by the post-earthquake fires (Ōmori et al. 1937, p. 24; Tsuruda 2011, p. 84).

The story so far has shown how the Great Kantō Earthquake produced conditions in which Teidai students complimented and contested extant state and non-state actors' approaches to disaster relief. Drawing on their technocratic training, the students were systematic and pragmatic in their approach to solving problems such as the distribution of supplies, the maintenance of hygienic conditions for the evacuees, and the rationalisation of communications. Already at this early stage they demonstrated remarkable capacity for processing and organising huge amounts of data and providing organisational solutions to complex problems. That being said, the students were also successful in aligning their activities with those of the authorities and were adept at manoeuvring through the complicated bureaucratic structures to achieve their goals. But how did a spontaneous, episodic reaction to crisis become institutionalised in the form of a Settlement house? What was the jurisdiction of the house and was it justified? It is to this phase we now turn.

**Justifying Settlement Work for Japan**

1  
2  
3 The earthquake relief activities continued until the end of 1923 by which point officials had  
4 a better handle on the problem. With the situation gradually improving, and with their  
5 studies waiting, the students petitioned the professors to stop their work and hand back to  
6 the state responsibility for managing the relief efforts. However, this did not happen, and in  
7 fact the students refocused and expanded the scope of their work. Why?  
8  
9  
10

11  
12  
13 Firstly, there was the influence of their professors. For Suehiro and Hozumi it seemed that  
14 to stop now would waste a nascent movement with the potential to transform the lives of  
15 the labouring masses and the students themselves. Furthermore, the Christian activist  
16 Kagawa Toyohiko (1888-1960), who was impressed by the work done by the Teidai students,  
17 had by now weighed in. Kagawa can be considered somewhat of a social entrepreneur. Two  
18 years earlier in 1921, after working with the labour movements in both the United States  
19 and Japan, he had established the Friends of Jesus Society (*Iesu no tomokai*) as a vehicle for  
20 putting into practice a social gospel of emancipation independent of more established  
21 congregations in Japan, which he found disappointingly out of touch with the realities of life  
22 for Japan's labouring poor. Much as with Settlement thought in the West, Kagawa's view of  
23 his Christian mission was of engagement with the poor with the aim of personal and social  
24 transformation, and he put this view into practice first in the slums of Kobe's Shinkawa  
25 district (Mullins 2007).<sup>6</sup> Kagawa was also well off financially – he had written a best-selling  
26 book the sales of which funded his activities with the poor. According to the recollections of  
27 the aforementioned Uchimura, Kagawa lobbied Suehiro, arguing that although the first  
28 stage of work in Ueno might be complete, winter was coming, and the evacuees still needed  
29 the students' help. When Suehiro brought this to the students they were reluctant at first,  
30 but after cajoling from the professors, including emotional references to the 'value of  
31 humanism', the 'strength of humanism' and 'coming to know the most important activities  
32 in life' through their relief experiences, it was decided that they would continue their work  
33 in the form of a perpetual student movement (*eikyū na gakusei undō*) (Ōmori et al. 1937, pp.  
34 25-26; Tsuruda 2015, p. 86; Uemura 1991, p. 35). It was Uchimura who suggested basing the  
35 new movement on Oxford University's Toynbee Hall (Fukushima et al. 1984, p. 4-5), and he  
36 was to become the first director of the Teidai Settlement.  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53

54  
55  
56 <sup>6</sup> Kagawa's own analysis of Settlement thought and practice can be found in Friends of Jesus No. 9 (Kagawa,  
57 1926).  
58  
59  
60

As well as the emotional pleas and the evident badgering by their professors, however, the Teidai Settlement came into being because the ideals of Settlement work were in alignment with broader trends in student thought and action of the time. In the 1920s, students in Japanese universities were becoming increasingly sensitive to questions of self-governance and democratisation, and by the early 1920s radical students were making a concerted effort to wrestle control of their institutions away from university administrators and right-wing student organisations.<sup>7</sup> The most notable example of this trend was the radical students of Tokyo Imperial University's Shinjinkai (New Man Society). The Shinjinkai, which grew out of a seminar given by the most prominent Taishō liberal theorist Yoshino Sakuzo, began as an organisation dedicated to liberalisation and democratisation of education, and in 1920 successfully established a cross-faculty student union, the Gakuyūkai (Student Friendship Association), to facilitate student governance at Tokyo Imperial (Smith 1972). Thus, the lofty ideals of the Settlement movement, which as we will see shortly were couched in terms of the democratisation of access to knowledge, as well as the emphasis on action independent of the authorities central to settlement work, would have no doubt appealed to student sensibilities of the time.

Perhaps more importantly though, in the early 1920s the Shinjinkai were becoming increasingly influenced by Marxist thought. In 1922 an underground Japanese Communist Party (JCP) had been established and left-wing students were some of the first members. Particularly important to the story of student participation in the Settlement was the publication by JCP founding member Yamakawa Hitoshi (1880-1958) of an article entitled 'A Change in Direction for the Proletarian Movement' (*Musan kaikyū undō no hōkō tenkan*) in the July-August 1922 edition of the Communist publication *Zenei* (Vanguard). In it Yamakawa admonished the proletarian movement in Japan for its tendency to either fall into theoretical abstractions or revel in pointless fighting with police. This approach, he argued, did nothing to forward the practical goal of realising socialism in Japan, and it alienated the very masses it was supposed to inspire. Instead Yamakawa called for socialists

<sup>7</sup> This drive for autonomy was not restricted to students. It is also important to note that since the turn of the 20<sup>th</sup> century, Japanese academics had been fighting for autonomy from government ministries (see Marshall 1982).

1  
2  
3 to re-engage with society under the slogan 'To the masses!' (*taishū no naka e*) (Scalapino  
4 1967, p. 20; Swearingen and Langer 1968, p. 15). Student radicals were themselves the  
5 target of just this sort of criticism from the broader socialist movement (Duus 1982, p.430).  
6  
7 Thus for Shinjinkai students ready to heed Yamakawa's call, a Toynbee Hall style settlement  
8 was an obvious vehicle for travelling to the masses and participating *as students* in the  
9 broader proletarian movement.  
10  
11  
12

13  
14  
15 However, not all Shinjinkai students agreed with this new direction in Japanese socialism.  
16 Indeed factional fighting within the Shinjinkai between the more gradualist liberals and the  
17 Leninist revolutionary students over the direction and end goal of their activities continued  
18 through the life of the settlement itself (Miyada 1995, pp.61-71). Furthermore, although the  
19 worker's education unit was heavily populated by Shinjinkai radicals, it would be inaccurate  
20 to paint the Teidai Settlement as simply an extension of Shinjinkai activities. Students from a  
21 wide range of backgrounds and motivations became involved, from Christians and Buddhists  
22 with ideals of social service, to those like future publisher Hikosaka Takeo (1905-1985) who  
23 was just looking for a nicer bedroom than the standard dingy university accommodation  
24 (Fukushima et. al. 1984, p. 132-133). Indeed, it was soon deemed by the Shinjinkai that the  
25 other students would react strongly to one ideological approach – namely Marxism –  
26 becoming ascendant, and after consultation with the steering committee of the Settlement,  
27 the Shinjinkai decided not to meddle in the affairs of other units (Iinkai 2014, p. 34). A final  
28 point to make here is that a certain romanticism was also a factor in students' participation  
29 in the Settlement. Students at this time were reading newly translated Russian literature,  
30 and were becoming enamoured of the Christian ethics running through Tolstoy, or with Ivan  
31 Turgenev's account of intellectuals abandoning city life to work with peasants in *Virgin Soil*,  
32 which was translated and published in Japan in 1914 (Miyada 1995, p.66). Thus, Suehiro and  
33 Hoizumi's appeals to humanist values would have resonated with students' romantic images  
34 of engaging with masses produced by this literature.  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50

51 But with the students now onboard, how was the Teidai Settlement justified? Suehiro's  
52 1924 prospectus for the Settlement (Ōmori 1937, pp. 31-32) and a speech he gave at the  
53 Association for Legal Research (*Hōri kenkyūkai*) in 1926 give a further sense of the early  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

theoretical underpinnings of the Teidai Settlement, and how the social intervention was justified in the context of Taishō Japan.

Suehiro's first argument concerned the rationale for settlement work and hinged on what he perceived as the unfair distribution of knowledge in Japan. Suehiro stated that the greatest tragedy of the age was the separation of knowledge and labour. He observed that only a tiny proportion of the nation – the rich elite – reaped the benefits of the Japanese education system, and instead of the nation of mass 'civilization and enlightenment' (*bunmei kaika*) sought after by the Meiji reformers, the proletariat (*musansha*), were still unable to progress past primary school education. Thrown into the labour force, the proletariat were thus trapped in a piteous state of ignorance. In an allusion to an organic conceptualisation of society seen in the Settlement movement in Great Britain, such a division of knowledge was not only terrible for the labouring classes, but also a great loss for society as a whole because, in a reference to the words of the great Meiji liberal reformer Fukuzawa Yukichi, they were unable to make the most of their 'gifts from heaven'. For Suehiro then, modernisation had produced a Japanese society in which the rich and fortunate had become the monopolisers of knowledge (*chishiki no dokusen-sha*). It is taken as read that this knowledge should be applied for the good of the poor as part of the development of a social nation (*shakai kokka*); but Suehiro argued that there was a higher moral obligation dictated by the concept of *noblesse oblige* (Ōmori et al. 1937, p. 31). Thus, Suehiro saw the Settlement as a method of bringing labour and knowledge back together for the betterment of society as a whole (Uemura 1995, p. 37).

Refashioning the connection between labour and knowledge also had implications for the academic side of settlement work. For the settlement house was not simply a place for the transfer of cultural capital from student to worker; it was also a place of genuine learning for the settlers themselves. In this regard, Suehiro linked Settlement methodology to debates over the proper object of the social sciences in Japan, arguing:

At present the social sciences in our nation are, for the most part, imitations of the social sciences in the west. The true duty of social scientists must be to accurately record the reality of society itself. But the case of Great Britain and America, where

1  
2  
3 institutions for observation are already established, is particular. In nations such as  
4 ours where such institutions are lacking, we must use a range of facilities to observe  
5 society. This is one of the reasons for the establishment of the Teidai Settlement  
6 (Fukushima and Kawashima 1963, pp. 122-123).  
7  
8  
9

10  
11 Thus, true to his dedication to the doctrine of “living law” – that local social and legal orders  
12 develop organically, and that scholarship and practice must engage with the messiness of  
13 the everyday if the goal of legal equity was to be realised – Suehiro maintained that for the  
14 social sciences in Japan to progress there was a pressing need for data collected from  
15 Japanese society itself. That various governmental institutions had begun collecting this  
16 data was for Suehiro a wonderful thing (*mottomo yorokobu koto*), but he saw as even more  
17 important students entering society, working with people directly, and putting their  
18 disciplinary training to use while collecting detailed data about the lives of the working poor.  
19 Therefore, the Teidai Settlement became a manifestation of an ideal of a Japanese social  
20 science: one that took as its object the development of modernity in Japanese society, and  
21 one that had the capacity to ameliorate modernity’s impact through the proper application  
22 of social scientific method (Ōmori et al. 1937, p. 32).  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33

34 What confuses matters, however, is the language in which Suehiro couches this argument.  
35 By talking of the elite as contemporary society’s monopolisers of knowledge (*chishiki no*  
36 *dokusensha*) and speaking of the working classes as the proletariat (*musansha*), Suehiro’s  
37 tone has a Marxist inflection, and could thus be considered dangerously anti-state. In fact,  
38 Suehiro himself was by now attracting the attention of the authorities as a potentially  
39 subversive influence (Miyada 1995, p. 80). Suehiro, however, is careful not to argue for  
40 revolution or even a radical redistribution of material wealth. Rather, he is careful to stay in  
41 the realm of knowledge, and, even then, only advocates that those with the requisite gifts  
42 from heaven should be given access to means by which they can make best use of those  
43 gifts *for the nation*. Suehiro’s conceptualisation of settlement work is thus consonant with  
44 the progressive gradualism of Great Britain’s New Liberalism. Socialism was about ensuring  
45 fair access to existing social goods, such as education, within the existing political and  
46 economic framework of the Japanese nation. It was not a radical attempt to call into  
47 question the configuration of that framework as a whole.  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

The same is true of the social scientific component of the argument. The production of a scientifically accurate understanding of the labouring classes could easily be seen as assembling a body of knowledge demonstrating state exploitation of the proletariat, and thus providing a rationale for organisation and agitation. But Suehiro avoids this pitfall by aligning the activities of the Settlement with the survey work already being conducted by the state. Furthermore, these endeavours are justified as a means towards breaking free of a slavish adherence to Western, idealist, social scientific approaches so as to develop a form of rigorous enquiry fit for the particular context of Japanese modernity. Thus, by placing so much emphasis on the proper scientific study of working-class districts, the settlement workers were integrated into a bigger governmental push to collect data on working-class districts as a method of better managing their impact on the health of the national body (Gotō 2014, p. 65).

**Towards Equilibrium: Putting Settlement Theory into Practice**

After a number of locations were surveyed and discussed, and after attracting funding from a range of public and private benefactors to supplement cash reserves of 10 000 yen built up during the earthquake relief work (Fukushima and Kawashima 1963, p. 82) the Teidai Settlement House was sited in Yanagishima (now somewhere between present day Sumida and Edo) and celebrated its completion on 6<sup>th</sup> July 1924. It opened its doors to its first residents on the 10<sup>th</sup> (Ōmori et al. 1937, p. 6). The reasoning behind choosing Yanagishima is indicative of the jurisdictional scope of the house. Uchimura recalled that the Teidai students originally surveyed the Sarue district of Fukagawa ward, but in the opinions of the majority of the settlers the fact that it was a ‘slum’ made it unfit for settlement activities. Indeed, much like the Tokyo bureaucrats behind the first Social Bureau for the City of Tokyo discussed earlier, the students made a distinction between charity (*jizen*) and their social work (*shakai jigyo*). Accordingly, as a place of very low living standards and populated by lumpenproletariat (*runpen teki na rōdōsha*) Fukugawa needed charity, and as such a site more suitable for missionary work (Ōmori et al. 1937, p. 155). Yanagishima was chosen because it fit the criteria of being ‘not too far from Hongo and being a town of workers with hope for their lives and a relative thirst for self-improvement’ (Fukushima et. al. 1984, p. 59).



Thus, we see that the settlers were not interested in working with those who had completely fallen through the cracks of Japanese society, only those with, as they saw it, the potential for self-improvement. Also, we see in this decision the influence of Marxist thought channelled into the Settlement via its Shinjinkai members. For self-improvement on their view was not simply to be found in the acquisition of knowledge about the world, but the development of political subjectivity in the form of working-class consciousness.

The house became home to six different Settlement units: adult education, social surveys, child welfare, medicine, general consultation (later to be a legal advice centre), and a unit tasked with setting up a citizen's library (*shimin tosho*). Early activities included establishing a children's library, providing inoculations against typhoid for children, launching a school for workers (*rōdō gakkō*), and providing shelter for 36 people after the local area was flooded (Ōmori et al. 1937, p. 8). Soon the settlers were involved in a wide range of projects, and were producing detailed yearly accounts of their work, which contained masses of painstakingly collected data produced by the students from the social sciences on the social characteristics of the people they worked with. Indeed, in the early days it was said that 'research is the life-blood of the Settlement' (Miyada 1995, p. 61).

Alongside surveys, education, and particularly workers' education was core to the Settlement's work. It was also the unit most heavily populated by the Shinjinkai, for it was the most obvious method of responding as students to Yamakawa Hitoshi's call of going 'To the masses!'. Although the unit got off to a slow start the school had by autumn 1924 attracted over one hundred locals to the lecture programme. As well as distributing leaflets, Teidai students worked as tutors (*chūtā*), whose role was to introduce the visiting lecturers, chair the discussions and help manage difficult questions from the floor. Tutors were also called upon to deliver lectures when the professors did not turn up, which, in the recollections of the above mentioned Hikosaka was the cause of quite some anxiety (Fukushima et al. 1984, p. 134). The lectures themselves ranged in content from the social history of Japan, to worker's hygiene, to the fundamentals of economics. Perhaps unsurprisingly, topics that resonated with the interests and life-worlds of the audiences, such as labour history and hygiene, were attended to with great interest; more abstract



1  
2  
3 topics such as economic theory tended to send the audience, who had spent a hard day at  
4 work already, to sleep (ibid.).  
5

6  
7 But what did the labour school look like from the perspective of the students? The  
8 recollections of one student, Morikawa Masaki help shed some light in this regard. As a  
9 manual labourer (*tobishoku*) educated to primary school level but who kept abreast of the  
10 news via the papers, Morikawa was perhaps an ideal candidate for the labour school. After  
11 being handed a leaflet in the street in December 1929, Morikawa sought out the Settlement  
12 and climbed the stairs to the second floor at which point he was greeted by a ‘pleasant man  
13 wearing glasses.’ On asking to sign up to the labour school Morikawa was bombarded with  
14 questions – profession, education, recently read books – and after answering to the best of  
15 his ability he was admitted to school and asked to pay tuition fees of 50 sen per month. The  
16 classes themselves Morikawa characterised as ‘a place to learn the theory of Marxism’,  
17 which was populated not only by factory workers, but also representatives of left wing  
18 farmer’s unions, disengaged onlookers, and the occasional, and obvious, plainclothes police  
19 agent. Morikawa’s example also shows how the labour school had a direct impact on the  
20 politics of some attendees. Soon, he was involved in distribution of the proletarian literature  
21 magazine *Senki*,<sup>8</sup> and when the labour school closed its doors in 1934, he was recruited to  
22 the Kantō branch of the anarchist All-Japan Libertarian Federation of Labour Unions  
23 (*Zenkoku rōdō kumiai jiyū rengōkai*) by Utagawa Noboru (1895-1944), who himself displayed  
24 much interest in Morikawa’s impressions of the Settlement (Fukushima et al. 1984, pp,  
25 157-161).  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41

42 As can be seen from Morikawa’s recollections, workers education was also the unit that  
43 attracted the most attention from the state: both welcome and unwelcome. Even with  
44 funding and recognition from the establishment, the house attracted the suspicions of other  
45 elements of the authorities. But here Suehiro’s liberal justifications for the Teidai  
46 Settlement’s work, and the careful way in which that work was framed, proved useful. In his  
47 memoirs, one settler recounts a visit by four Special Higher Police (*tokkō*) agents in 1925, the  
48 year the repressive Peace Preservation Law was passed that criminalised all those who  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54

55  
56 <sup>8</sup> *Senki* was published between 1928 and 1931 and carried some of the most celebrated stories of the  
57 proletarian literature movement, including Kobayashi Takiji’s 1929 story *Crab Cannery Ship* (*Kani kōsen*)  
58  
59

1  
2  
3 tried to alter the Japanese body politic (*kokutai*) and the system of private property (for  
4 details see Mitchell 1973). The agents were keen to learn more of the settlement activities,  
5 and especially those of the Worker's School unit, which as noted above was dominated by  
6 the increasingly Marxist, and for the state increasingly suspicious, Shinjinkai. On being  
7 questioned about the Worker's School in particular, the settler explained that:

13 Students at public universities are able to study at the highest level while paying  
14 minimal fees due to the taxes of our citizens. With this in mind we felt we must pass  
15 this knowledge forward (*chishiki o osusowake*) and thus set up the Worker's School...  
16  
17 (Fukushima et al. 1984, p. 62)

21 Suehiro's logic seemed to do the trick: The Higher Police agents saluted and left. The same  
22 settler also remembers an impromptu visit by a delegation of officials led by the Minister of  
23 Home Affairs Wakatsuki Reijrō, after which he realised his flies had been unbuttoned the  
24 entire time (ibid.).

30 Along with the surveys and workers' education units, the Legal Advice Unit (*hōristu sōdan-*  
31 *bu*) was also central to Suehiro and Hozumi's plans. As with Suehiro's justification of the  
32 Settlement detailed above, the Legal Advice Unit had a dual role. First it was recognised that  
33 ignorance could lead to workers falling foul of the law through no fault of their own, or in  
34 more extreme cases that the law could be used as a weapon against them. Sessions such as  
35 the regular Tuesday lecture 'Stories of indispensable law for everyday life' (*nichijō hitsuyō*  
36 *na hōristu no hanashi*) were thus designed to provide a basic level of legal awareness to  
37 mitigate such abuses (Ōmori, et. al. eds. 1937, p.142). However, it is in the Legal Advice  
38 Bureau that we see the clearest manifestation of Suehiro and Hozumi's scholarly legal  
39 interests, both for research into 'the living law' and for legal pedagogy. By advising residents  
40 on their legal issues, the professors hoped to learn more about how abstract laws came  
41 alive in concrete localities, while also providing law students the opportunity to engage with  
42 their studies beyond the classroom. This work fell mostly to Hozumi and a revolving roster  
43 of other Teidai law professors when it became clear that Suehiro's growing reputation as a  
44 critic of the state might draw unwelcome attention to the Settlement's activities and put the  
45 Settlement's revenue, which relied primarily on donations, in jeopardy (Miyada 1995, pp.90-

100). Not all the other professors engaged regularly, but Hozumi's dedication to the centre is remarked upon in the recollections of a number of past settlers: even in terrible weather he would turn up in his wellington boots, work a full day, and eat with the students in the canteen (see for example Fukushima et al. 1984, p. 146). These warm memories aside, however, the settlers' assessment of their overall impact was pessimistic. Those who came to the centre for advice were all, in the words of the 1937 review of the Settlement's activities, 'terminally ill patients' (*teokure byōsha*). In other words there was very little that could be done for them. Indeed, the experience of seeing the abstract law come to life in this setting was sobering for the students and professors, as the cases demonstrated time and again that the law was being used by the economically advantaged to dominate the weak (Ōmori, et. al. eds. 1937, p.142).

The operation of the law in concrete circumstances was just one of the facet of social reality observed by the settlers, who documented their activities across a range of publications including the self-published journals *Settler* and *Settlement Monthly*,<sup>9</sup> and the *Annual Bulletin of the Tokyo Imperial University Settlement* (*Tōkyō teikoku daigaku setsurumento nenpō*). The Annual Bulletins in particular stand testament to the methodical approach to data collection employed by the settlers in their attempt to provide a true social science for Japan. Each unit presented in detail activities completed through the year, as well as data collected about the students and expenditures. For example, figure 1, taken from workers' education unit's section of the 2<sup>nd</sup> Annual Bulletin breaks down the constitution of the class by age, union membership, profession and academic background. Figure 2, taken from the same Bulletin but this time from the child welfare unit documents parents' professions and thus provides a snap-shot of the employment characteristics of those living in the area, while figure 3, this time from the medical unit classifies patients by nature of illness and profession.

<sup>9</sup> Settler began publication in 1924 it is unknown exactly when publication finished. Settlement Monthly began publication in 1925; again it is unknown when the publication folded. The Annual Bulletins were a fixture of the Settlement, and were published from 1925-1937 (Fukushima et al. 1984, p. 477)

左に年齢、組織別、産業別、及び組織別學歷別の表を示す。

産業別	18-20		21-23		24-26		27-29		30-40		計
	組	非	組	非	組	非	組	非	組	非	
金屬工業		5	1	5	1	2				2	16
纖維工業		2			1			1			4
化學工業				1	2					1	4
印刷業				1		2	1			1	5
木材業				1	1	1					3
事務員			1								1
その他	1	1	2	5		1					10
計	1	9	6	13	5	4		1	1	3	43
總計	10		19		9		1				

  

學歷別	組合加入者	非加入者	計
尋小卒	5	13	18
高未		2	2
小卒	5	8	13
中未	2	5	7
等卒	1	2	3
計	13	30	43

Figure 1 Labour School Student Classification

父母の職業別は

計	父母の職業別は									
	死	無職	其他	商人	自由労働	工場労働	家内工業	職人	父	母
三		二				一			女工	
三	一						一	一	駄菓子商	
一五			三		二	五	一	四	内足袋其他	
四				一	一		二		家業手傳	
九			一		二	四		二	無職	
二				一			一		死亡	
二九	三六	一	二	四	二	五	一	五	六	計

Figure 2 Parents' Occupation

患者職業別 (14年6月—15年3月) (第四表)

	内科	外科	眼科	不明	計
工場労働者男女	26	12	5	4	47
同家族	4	4	1		9
交通労働者	25	10	11	3	49
同家族	2	2	2		6
自由労働者及被服人	5	2	6		13
同家族	6	5	2	4	17
職家	12	6	4		22
同家族	14	20	4	2	40
家内工業	39	9	17	5	70
同家族	12	7	3		22
係給者	28	10	7		45
同家族	9	1			10
店舗商	16	6	9	2	33
同家族	19	7	5	2	33
路次商	38	11	22	13	84
同家族	5				5
店員	3		2	1	6
女中	2				2
其他			2		2
其	6	3	2		11
無職	14	6	8	2	30
不	23	14	21	6	69
計	313	135	133	44	625

三九

Figure 3 Patients classified by illness and occupation

Suehiro’s liberal, empowerment through knowledge approach couched in terms of betterment of the nation had its utility, but could not ward off internal tensions which led to another disturbance within the settlement itself. Feelings of impotence, such as in the case of the Legal Advice Unit, rekindled debates over the nature and objectives of the settlement’s work. As Masaharu (1993) has documented, after three years of work the Teidai settlers, and in particular those belonging to the Shinjinkai, called for a comprehensive ‘self-criticism’ (*jiko hihan*) of their work so far (Ōmori et al. 1937, p. 206). After a period of debate across Settler publications, the students concluded that that their work was only a drop in the ocean of what needed to be done, and that their approach, which was grounded in the ethos of relief work, was too close in character to charity. As such their efforts had no emancipatory value (Fukushima et al. 1984, p. 126). The result of this criticism was the conclusion that the students’ true role was to ‘give [the proletariat] the power to emancipate themselves’ with the aim of fostering then handing over to the proletariat their own ‘movement’ (ibid., p. 207-208; Fukushima et al. 1984, p. 72). Ideas were not enough: the working classes needed material resources to better their situation.

With this aim in mind, it was decided that the Settlers would adopt a plan presented by economics student and Shinjinkai member Azuma Toshihisa to establish a cooperative

society (*shōhi kumiai*). The goal of the cooperative would be to help rationalise the consumption habits of the poor (*shōhi seikatsu o gōriteki ni*) and cut out from their everyday consumption those who made profit from the sale of staple goods (Ōmori et al. 1937, p. 211). Representatives from all the units worked together in 1926 to develop a plan for the new cooperative and on 1<sup>st</sup> August 1927 it opened for business (Fukushima et al. 1984, p. 72). This initiative continued through the economic crisis of the late 1920s and early 1930s, before collapsing under the weight of economic pressure, management problems, difficulties with normalising the cooperative ideal with the people, and increased pressure from a government becoming ever more intolerant of activities it perceived as threatening to the national body (Masaharu 1993, p. 322).

## Conclusion

The closure of the cooperative foreshadowed the end of the Settlement itself. For as Japan journeyed further towards war, the Teidai Settlement came under unbearable pressure from the authorities and was forced to close itself down in 1938 (Asahi Shimbun 1938; Uemura 1995, p. 38). The closure also brings to the fore a clear difference between Settlement activities in Great Britain and the US and those in Japan. As Fukushima Masao noted in a speech in 1962, from the beginning to the end of activities the Teidai Settlement operated in a competitive relationship (*taikō kankei*) with state power (Fukushima and Kawashima 1963, p. 89). As has been shown in the discussion above, the Teidai Settlement competition for jurisdiction over Japan's 'social problem' began with the Great Kantō Earthquake and saw settlers carefully delineate their jurisdiction by articulating their goals within a framework of national betterment. But pressures internal to the Settlement itself, namely a tension between the imperative of engaging with the working poor to better integrate them into national structures of health and knowledge, and the drive to give workers the tools to liberate themselves from exploitation within the same system, meant that the Settlement was never on stable ground.

In a final note on the closure of the Teidai Settlement, Hozumi wrote that: 'after the war there will be a need for neighbourhood mutual assistance projects. It is my hope that people from all walks of life take on settlement institutions and put them to work for the

people' (Fukushima and Kawashima 1963, p. 136). Indeed, as early as December 1945, Suehiro was in discussions at Tokyo University to restart activities (Asahi Shimbun 1945). The story told here has thus started to document a social movement that predated the Teidai Settlement and has continued from the end of the Second World War to the present day. This movement comprised of a wide range of different houses with an equally wide range of motivations, theoretical orientations, goals, and locations. The questions now include how these different settlements interacted with their local circumstances and each other, what bodies of knowledge they produced, how that knowledge came to be used, and how the Settlement ideal morphed as social, political and ideological contexts shifted over time. Doing so will fill in gaps in our knowledge of the student movement, of the development of welfare in Japan, and of the Settlement movement as global history.

#### References:

- Asahi Shimbun, 1938. *Teidai setsurumento: totsujō hesa wo kessu*. 3 March, p. 11.
- Asahi Shimbun, 1945. *Tōdai setsurumento*. 14 December, p. 34.
- Abbot, A., 1988. *The System of Professions: an essay on the division of expert labor*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Asano, T., 1995. Senzen hoiku undo ni okeru "hahaoya shidō": Tōkyō teikokudaigaku setsurumento takujibu to Togoshi hoikujō no jissen wo chūshin ni. *Japanese Educational Research Association*, 54, pp. 136-137.
- Borland, J., 2006. Capitalising on catastrophe: reinvigorating the Japanese state with moral values through education following the 1923 Great Kantō Earthquake. *Modern Asian Studies*, 40(4), pp. 875-907.
- Borland, J., 2011. Stories of ideal Japanese subjects from the Great Kantō Earthquake of 1923. *Japanese Studies*, 25(1), pp. 21-34.
- Carson, M., 1990. *Settlement Folk: social thought and the American Settlement Movement 1885-1930*. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press.
- Clancey, G., 2006. *Earthquake Nation: the cultural politics of Japanese seismicity, 1868-1930*. London: California University Press.
- Duus, P., 1982. Liberal Intellectuals and Social Conflict in Taishō Japan. In T., Najita and V., Koschmann, eds. *Conflict in modern Japanese history: the neglected tradition*. Princeton: Princeton University Press, pp.412-440.



- Evans, R.A., 2006. The University and the City: the educational work of Toynbee Hall, 1884-1914. *History of Education*, 11(2), pp.113–125.
- Freedon, M., 1986. *The new Liberalism: an ideology of social reform*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Fukumoto, M., 2001. Tōkyō teikokudaigaku setsurumento takujibu ni okeru chikubetsu gurūpu no jissen: Suzuki Toku ni yoru hoiku to hahaoya no kyōdō. *Research on Early Childhood Care and Education in Japan*, 39(2), pp. 482-483.
- Fukushima, M., and Kawashima, T., eds., 1963. *Hozumi, Suehiro ryōsensei to setsurumento*. Tokyo: Tōkyō daigaku setsurumento hōritsu sōdanbu.
- Fukushima, M., 1984. *Kaisō no tōkyō teidai setsurumento*. Toyko: Nihon Hyōronsha.
- Garon, S., 1987. *The State and Labour in Modern Japan*. London: University of California Press.
- Gotō, M., 2014. The Ideal of "Sociological Medicine" and the Design of "Social Service" Between the Word Wars in Japan [Senkanki nihon ni okeru "shakaigaku" no rinen to "shakaijigyō no kōsō: Tokyo teidai setsurumento no katsudō o tōshite. *The Annual Review of Sociology*, 27, pp. 61-72.
- Hanes, J.E., 2012. Progressivism for the Pacific world: Urban social policymaking in modern Osaka. *City, Culture and Society*, 3(1), pp.79–85.
- Hanes J. E., 2008. Pacific Crossings?. In Saunier PY., Ewen S. eds, *Another Global City*. New York: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Hastings, S., A. 1995. *Neighborhood and Nation in Tokyo, 1905-1937*. London: University of Pittsburgh Press.
- Hikawaka setsurumento-shi hensan iinkai, 2014. *Hikawaka setsurumento-shi: hanseiki ni wataru katsudō no kiroku*. Tokyo: Iederu kenkyūjo.
- Kagawa, T., 1926. *Setsurumento undō no riron to jissai*. Iesu no yūsōsho No. 9. Tokyo: Iesu no tomokai.
- Masaharu, K., 1993. A Study on Voluntary Social Work in the Showa Panic [Shōwa kyōkōki no shisetsu shakaijigyō: shakai jigyo no ikitsumaruru to setsurumento. *Bulletin of Kyushu Ryukoku Junior College*, 39, pp.303-331.
- Mitchell, R.H., 1973. Japan's Peace Preservation Law of 1925: Its Origins and Significance. *Monumenta Nipponica*, 28(3), pp.317–345.
- Miyada, S., 1995. *Dare ga kaze o mita deshō*. Tokyo: Bungei Shunju.
- Morgan, J., M., 2016. *Equity under Empire: Suehiro Izutarō and the Birth of the Law-and-Society Movement in Japan*. Unpublished PhD thesis. University of Madison-Wisconsin.



Nakasuji, N., 1998. Isomura toshi shakaigaku no yōran: Tōkyō teidai setsurumento to Toda shakaigaku. *The Annals of Japan Association for Urban Sociology*, 16, 29-47.

Ōbayashi, M., 2008 [1922]. *Settsurumento no kenkyū*. Tokyo: Keibunsha.

Ōmori, T. et. al. eds. 1937. *Tōkyō teikoku daigaku setsurumento 12 nen shi*. Tokyo: Tōkyō teikoku daigaku setsurumento.

Pyle, K.B., 1974. Advantages of Followership: German Economics and Japanese Bureaucrats, 1890-1925. *Journal of Japanese Studies*, 1(1), pp.127–164.

Pyle, K.B., 1973. The Technology of Japanese Nationalism: The Local Improvement Movement, 1900-1918. *The Journal of Asian Studies*, 33(1), pp.51-65.

Reinders, R.C., 1982. Toynbee Hall and the American settlement movement. *Social Service Review*, 56(1), pp.39–54.

Scalapino, R., A., 1967. *The Japanese Communist Movement, 1920-1966*. Berkeley: University of California Press.

Smith, H., 1970. The origins of student radicalism in Japan. *Journal of Contemporary History*, 5(1), pp.87–103.

Swearingen, R., and Langer, P., 1968. *Red Flag in Japan: International Communism in action 1919-1951*. New York: Greenwood Press.

Tsuruda, I., 2015. Kantō daishinsaiji no gakusei no kyujo katsudō: tōkyō teikoku daigaku gakusei kyūgo dan o chūshin ni. *Hiroshima kokusai daigaku kyōshokushitsu kyōikuron gyō*, 7, pp. 81-88.

Uemura, Y., 1995. Daisaigai ga shakaifukushi ni oyabosu eikyō ni tsuite: Kantōdaishinsai ni okeru gakkō kyūendan o chūshin ni. *Tenri University Journal of Social Welfare Studies*, 3, pp.31-40.

Yomiuri Shinbun, 1923. *Tazunebito o mōshide deyo*. 12 September, p. 1.